Amendment

A. Specification

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 9, line 3 with the following new paragraph:

A1 An overview of the present invention is illustrated in Fig 1. Initially, an author writes an article and is seeking to have that article published in a journal serving the field that is relevant to the subject matter of the article. In step 10, the author submits the article to the journal. In one embodiment, the author submits the article to the journal by connecting to the journal's Web site and uploading the article as a document. This allows the author to instantaneously submit the article to the journal.

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 10, line 8 with the following new paragraph:

A2 If the article is provisionally accepted, subject to certain required revisions, the revision process is initiated, as illustrated in step 80. This process allows the author to edit the article, making changes where appropriate and as required by the editorial staff. When the author has completed the revision of the article, the author re-submits the article and the review process begins anew. However, in the iterative rounds of revision and review, the steps for selecting reviewers can be advantageously eliminated, as reviewers have previously been selected and assigned to the article.

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 14, line 9 with the following new paragraph:

A3 In one embodiment, the Web site may automatically send a request by email to the top ranked potential reviewers. This list may be modified somewhat by suggestions for potential reviewers supplied by the author as discussed previously with reference to Fig. 2. The number of potential reviewers selected for automatic request by email may be set by the editorial board and configurable as a parameter in the journal's Web site. For example, if the editorial board determined that automatic requests should be sent to four potential reviewers for each article, the Web site would query the database to find the four top ranked scholars. Additionally, the list may be refined per the author's suggestions and an email would automatically be sent to each of the remaining four potential reviewers.

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 16, line 19 with the following new paragraph:

A4

In step 330, the reviewer has the ability to set certain access privileges on the evaluation. For example, certain fields of the evaluation form are confidential between the reviewer and the editorial staff. However, the reviewer may elect to open up access to those fields so that other reviewers and possibly the author may access those fields. In one embodiment, each reviewer is granted access to submitted evaluation forms only after that reviewer has submitted an evaluation form. Advantageously, this maintains the integrity of each reviewer's evaluation of the article. As evaluation forms are submitted, each reviewer may be notified that the other reviewer has submitted the evaluation form. As illustrated in step 340, once a reviewer has completed the evaluation form, that form is submitted to the journal's editorial staff. Furthermore, as mentioned above and shown in step 350, after the reviewer has submitted an evaluation form, that reviewer may access other submitted evaluation forms for comparison.

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 22, line 21 with the following new paragraph:

A5

Referring back to the overview in Fig. 1, after the author submits the revised article, the review process in step 20 begins again. This is the beginning of a second cycle of the article through the peer review process. However, new reviewers are not selected for subsequent iterations of the peer review process as reviewers have already been selected for the article. After the second review process is completed, the revised article passes on to a second editorial recommendation in step 30 and ultimately to a second publication decision as described above in step 40 of Fig. 1. As can be seen, the process that a submitted article goes through is cyclical. A single article may iterate through the above-described processes several times before it is ultimately accepted for publication or finally rejected.